



State of Florida
Department of Children and Families

Charlie Crist
Governor

George H. Sheldon
Secretary

Office of Inspector General

Enhancing Public Trust in Government

REDACTED

OIG Investigation

2009 – 0046

November 6, 2009

Sheryl G. Steckler
Inspector General

Keith R. Parks
Chief of Investigations

*"Provide leadership in the promotion of
accountability and integrity of State Government."*



Mission: Protect the Vulnerable, Promote Strong and Economically Self-Sufficient Families, and
Advance Personal and Family Recovery



DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

George H. Sheldon
Secretary

Office of Inspector General Investigative Report Case Number: 2009-0046



Sheryl G. Steckler
Inspector General

Introduction:

Section 409.1671, Florida Statutes, directs the Department of Children and Families (Department) to outsource the provision of family services by contracting with qualified organizations for an integrated system of Community-Based Care (CBC). Through Department Contract #GJ160, between the Department and Family Services of Metro Orlando (FSMO), covering the period of January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2010, FSMO serves as the lead CBC agency in Circuit 9's area of responsibility (Orange and Osceola Counties). Through FSMO Contract #CM803, covering the period of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2009¹, Devereux Foundation, Inc. is subcontracted to deliver child welfare services to clients in Orange and Osceola Counties via Devereux Florida² (Devereux).

Devereux Program Director Julian Green reported to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) that he was informed by Devereux Family Case Manager Supervisor (CMS) Amy Elias that former³ Devereux Family Case Manager (CM) Terrance Hatcher was suspected of falsifying home visits in Florida Safe Families Network⁴ (FSFN) Case ID #100037120 involving 8-year-old [REDACTED] (hereinafter referred to as "child 1") and 3-year-old [REDACTED] (hereinafter referred to as "child 2"), who had been placed in the home of their paternal grandparents, [REDACTED] (hereinafter referred to as "the grandmother" and "the grandfather," respectively). Mr. Green indicated that according to Ms. Elias, during a random validation call⁵ (May 6, 2009), the grandmother related that she had not seen Mr. Hatcher the previous month (April 2009); however, FSFN contained documentation that Mr. Hatcher had conducted a face-to-face home visit on April 20, 2009 with child 1, child 2, the grandmother, the grandfather, and child 1 and child 2's father, [REDACTED] (hereinafter referred to as "the father"). Mr. Green further reported that CMS Naomi Ricketts conducted a face-to-face home visit with the grandmother on May 8, 2009, at which time the grandmother indicated that she had not seen Mr. Hatcher since January 2009, even though Mr. Hatcher's FSFN chronological notes indicated that he conducted face-to-face home visits on February 16, 2009, March 18, 2009, April 20, 2009, and May 5, 2009.

¹ Contract #CM803 was renewed as Contract #CM903 (during the middle of the contract term), which covers the period of July 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009.

² Devereux is part of the national Devereux Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization providing services around the nation for persons with emotional, developmental, and educational disabilities.

³ Effective May 14, 2009, Mr. Hatcher was no longer employed by Devereux.

⁴ The Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN) is Florida's federally funded Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System that provides information to support multiple community-based organizations and Sheriff's offices, in partnership with the State of Florida, to identify victims of abuse and neglect.

⁵ According to information obtained from Devereux, validation calls are conducted monthly by CMSs to ensure that CMs are completing home visits. CMS' randomly choose 2 cases, per worker, per month to validate.

Based on the information provided by Mr. Green, the OIG subsequently initiated an investigation on June 16, 2009.

Allegation and Findings:**Allegation:**

Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher falsified child protective supervision records in FSFN Case ID #100037120. If supported, the allegation would constitute a violation of Section I.C.1. of Department Contract #GJ160, between the Department and Family Services of Metro Orlando (FSMO); Section 2.1, Article II, of Contract #CM803, between FSMO and Devereux Foundation, Inc.; Section 6 of the Devereux Foundation, Inc. Employee Handbook; and a potential violation of §839.13(2)(a) and (c), F.S.

Findings:

Information obtained ***neither supports nor refutes*** the allegation.

CMS Amy Elias stated that FSFN Case ID #100037120 was assigned to Mr. Hatcher in November 2008 and he was required to complete a home visit a minimum of once, every 30 days. Ms. Elias explained that while conducting validation calls on May 6, 2009, she learned from the grandmother that Mr. Hatcher did not conduct a home visit in April 2009 (it is noted that the grandmother did not make any statements about the May 2009 home visit). Ms. Elias indicated that she asked the grandmother if any of the other adults living in the home had knowledge of Mr. Hatcher conducting a home visit in April 2009, and after checking with the other family members, the grandmother stated that neither the father nor the grandfather had seen Mr. Hatcher in April 2009. According to Ms. Elias, the grandmother did not say anything about other missed home visits and seemed hesitant in her answers, as if she did not want to get Mr. Hatcher into trouble. Ms. Elias stated that she had no reason to believe that Mr. Hatcher had falsified any home visits because none of the family members had ever indicated otherwise.

CMS Naomi Ricketts related that during her home visit on May 8, 2009, the grandmother stated that Mr. Hatcher's last face-to-face home visit was believed to have been in December 2008 or January 2009. Furthermore, the grandmother explained that Mr. Hatcher was a very good case manager by phone, since he called often; however, the grandmother stated that he never came to the home. Ms. Ricketts indicated that during her conversation with the father, he was not very talkative, and stated that he traveled for work and was unable to verify previous home visits. According to Ms. Ricketts, the father was asked about the May 5, 2009 home study that Mr. Hatcher documented in FSFN; however, the father said that this did not occur because he was on his way to work and Mr. Hatcher was only at the home for five minutes. Ms. Ricketts stated that the grandmother explained that she did not report Mr. Hatcher because she did not want to cause trouble and knew that child 1 and child 2 were safe. Ms. Ricketts explained that child 1 and child 2 indicated that they had seen Mr. Hatcher at the home "a while ago;" however, they were unable to provide more specific answers.

The following discrepancies were noted between FSFN chronological documentation, Home Visit Logs, and witness testimonies:

May 5, 2009: 4:30 p.m.⁶ (the grandmother, the father, the aunt, child 1, and child 2)

- The grandmother stated that Mr. Hatcher did not conduct a home visit in May 2009.
- The father related that he did not recall Mr. Hatcher coming to the home in May 2009, but did recall a conversation regarding a home study (unknown date). The father could not recall if this conversation was in person or by phone.
- [REDACTED] (hereinafter referred to as "the aunt") said that Mr. Hatcher did not come to the home in May 2009.
- There was no Home Visit Log (HVL) found in the case file for this date.
- Mr. Hatcher did not submit any mileage claims in May 2009.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed that he worked between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (eight hours) on May 5, 2009. According to Ms. Elias, Mr. Hatcher was a salaried employee; however, his timesheets may not accurately reflect the actual hours worked since salaried employees are not required to do so.

April 20, 2009: 5:30 p.m.⁷ (the grandmother, the grandfather, the father, child 1, and child 2)

- The grandmother explained that Mr. Hatcher did not conduct a home visit in April 2009.
- The grandmother stated that approximately 1-2 days prior to the validation call, Mr. Hatcher telephoned her and asked that she "please" tell his supervisor (unknown) that he had been conducting home visits. According to the grandmother, she told Mr. Hatcher that it had been a long time since he had been to the home, to which Mr. Hatcher responded that he was going to "get into a lot of trouble."
- The grandmother indicated that she received a second phone call from Mr. Hatcher (unknown date) who apologized for his previous phone call where he asked her to report that he had been conducting home visits.
- The grandfather stated that Mr. Hatcher did not conduct a home visit in April 2009.
- The father believed that he may have seen Mr. Hatcher in April 2009; however, he could not recall if that was at the home or the court.
- There was no HVL found in the case file for this date.
- Mr. Hatcher did not claim any mileage related to the family on April 20, 2009.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed that he worked between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (eight hours) on April 20, 2009.

⁶ No end time was documented.

⁷ No end time was documented.

March 18, 2009: 5:45 p.m.⁸ (the grandmother, child 1, and child 2)

- Initially, the grandmother did not recall meeting with Mr. Hatcher in March 2009; however, subsequently the grandmother stated that she may be confused about this time period.
- There was no HVL found in the case file for this date.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed 8 miles of travel related to a court proceeding involving the family on March 18, 2009, between 12:54 p.m. and 2:46 p.m., which was reimbursed at a rate of \$0.45 per mile (\$3.60). It is noted that Mr. Hatcher's FSFN chronological note indicates that he conducted a home visit beginning at 5:45 p.m. (there is no end time).
- Mr. Hatcher claimed that he worked between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (eight hours) on March 18, 2009.
 - When comparing mileage reimbursements for December 2008 and March 2009, it was noted by the OIG Investigator that it appeared as if the March 2009 mileage reimbursement was the same as the December 2008 mileage reimbursement, to include time of travel, purpose of travel, and daily mileage incurred, with the exception that the dates of travel were switched between December 2008 and March 2008.

February 16, 2009: 4:52 p.m. to 5:10 p.m. (the grandmother, the father, child 1, and child 2)

- The grandmother initially stated that she had not seen Mr. Hatcher since January 2009; however, after reviewing the FSFN chronological notes, the grandmother stated that the conversation seemed familiar, but she could not recall on what date this occurred. Subsequently, the grandmother stated that this home visit did occur.
- The father was unable to recall whether or not he saw Mr. Hatcher.
- Upon review of the HVL, the grandmother initially stated that her signature appeared to be authentic; however, the signature may be smaller than how she typically writes. Subsequently, the grandmother indicated that after further review of the HVL, she stated that some of the information contained in the HVL notes appeared to be information that she recalled discussing with Mr. Hatcher; however, the grandmother could not recall when that conversation took place.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed 34 miles of travel related to the family's residence on February 16, 2009, between 12:51 p.m. and 1:58 p.m., which was reimbursed at a rate of \$0.45 per mile (\$15.30). It is noted that Mr. Hatcher's FSFN chronological note indicates that he conducted a home visit between 4:52 p.m. and 5:10 p.m.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed that he worked between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (eight hours) on February 16, 2009.

⁸ No end time was documented.

January 22, 2009: 7:35 a.m. to 7:54 a.m. (the grandmother, the grandfather, child 1, and child 2)

- The grandmother stated that it would have been impossible for her to have met with Mr. Hatcher on this date because she was already at work at the time of the visit.
- The grandfather recalled a home visit during January 2009; however, he was unable to provide any further information.
- Upon review of the HVL, the grandfather indicated that his signature appeared to be authentic, but there were some discrepancies regarding the writing style related to the formation of some of the letters; however, the grandfather was unable to confirm or deny that the signature was authentic.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed 34 miles of travel related to the family's residence on January 22, 2009, between 11:30 a.m. and 12:46 p.m., which was reimbursed at a rate of \$0.45 per mile (\$15.30). It is noted that Mr. Hatcher's FSFN chronological note indicates that he conducted a home visit between 7:35 a.m. and 7:54 a.m.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed that he worked between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (eight hours) on January 22, 2009.

December 31, 2008: 1:25 p.m. to 1:42 p.m. (the grandmother, the father, child 1, and child 2)

- The grandmother did not recall Mr. Hatcher coming to the home; however, the grandmother did recall a face-to-face conversation with Mr. Hatcher sometime in December 2008.
- The father was unable to recall whether or not he saw Mr. Hatcher.
- Upon review of the Home Visit Log (HVL), the grandmother stated that her signature appears authentic; however, the grandmother noted that she typically signs on the line, but the signature on this document is completely off the line on all 4 pages. Furthermore, the grandmother noted that the document was blank and she does not recall signing a blank document.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed 34 miles of travel related to the family's residence on December 31, 2008, between "1:45 a.m." [sic] and 3:27 p.m., which was reimbursed at a rate of \$0.45 per mile (\$15.30). It is noted that Mr. Hatcher's FSFN chronological note indicates that he conducted a home visit between 1:25 p.m. and 1:42 p.m.
- Mr. Hatcher claimed that he worked between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (eight hours) on December 31, 2008.

CM Terrance Hatcher initially agreed to interview with the OIG Investigator; however, he subsequently declined to be interviewed. The OIG Investigator received a written response to the allegation from Mr. Hatcher on July 21, 2009, in which Mr. Hatcher denied the allegation that he falsified face-to-face home visits in FSFN Case ID #100037120 in February 2009, March 2009, or April 2009.⁹

⁹ Mr. Hatcher did not address any dates in his letter, rather Mr. Hatcher addressed various meetings with the family in his letter; however, none of his statements directly addressed the specific home visits in question.

Additional Allegation and Findings:**Additional Allegation:**

Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher attempted to interfere with an official investigation by contacting a witness in order to sway their testimony. If supported, the allegation would be a violation of Section I.C.1. of Department Contract #GJ160, between the Department and Family Services of Metro Orlando (FSMO); Section 2.1, Article II, of Contract #CM803, between FSMO and Devereux Foundation, Inc.; Section 6 of the Devereux Foundation, Inc. Employee Handbook; and a potential violation of § 914.22(3)(a) and (4)(b), F.S.

Findings:

Information obtained *supports* the allegation.

The grandmother stated that approximately 1-2 days prior to the validation call (May 6, 2009), Mr. Hatcher telephoned her and asked that she “please” tell his supervisor (unknown) that he (Mr. Hatcher) had been conducting home visits. According to the grandmother, she told Mr. Hatcher that it had been a long time since he had been to the home, to which Mr. Hatcher responded that he was going to “get into a lot of trouble.” The grandmother stated that she received a second phone call from Mr. Hatcher (unknown date) who apologized for his previous phone call where he asked her to report that he had been conducting home visits.

It is noted that during the OIG investigation, on July 23, 2009, the OIG Investigator received a facsimile from Mr. Hatcher, dated July 23, 2009, indicating that he had sent the grandmother a letter, via U.S. Mail, which was dated July 21, 2009. A review of Mr. Hatcher’s letter to the grandmother contained the following quoted information:

Dear [grandmother]:

In May, I had a meeting at Devereux in which I was informed that your family had stated that I had not visited your home in the 3 previous months (February, March, and April 2009). We both know this is not true. I have been going over and over in my brain trying to figure out why your family would have done this and the only thing that I can come up with is that maybe you all did it because you were upset that I was pushing the issue for the children to have contact with their biological mother.

Largely because of your statements, I was terminated...Since my termination, I have not been able to get a job, not been eligible for unemployment and thus I have not been able to provide for my family or pay my child support obligations.

Right now, I am humbly asking you to contact the Office of the Inspector General and tell them the truth so I can get my life back...I pray that God puts in your heart to do the right thing. I will continue to pray for you and your family.

Risk Assessment:

Devereux Program Director Julian Green stated that a Risk Assessment had been completed of all of Mr. Hatcher's open cases and as of May 18, 2009, the 13 children involved in Mr. Hatcher's 9 cases had been seen and deemed to be safe.

Devereux CMS Amy Elias stated that the average caseload in Mr. Hatcher's unit was 9 cases, with a total of approximately 15.3 children.

Inspector General's Comments:

Witness testimony from the grandmother indicated that the home visits for January 22, 2009, April 20, 2009, and May 5, 2009 did not occur. However, other household members could not specifically recall any of the visits, and as such, the allegation that Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher falsified child protective supervision records in FSFN Case ID #100037120 is ***neither supported nor refuted***. It is noted that Mr. Hatcher did not complete a travel voucher for May 5, 2009.

Based on witness testimony and records reviewed, the Additional Allegation that Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher attempted to interfere with an official investigation by contacting a witness in order to sway their testimony is ***supported***.

It is recommended that the Central Regional Director review this investigation, provide a copy of this report to the management of Family Services of Metro Orlando and Devereux Foundation, Inc., and ensure that the findings of this report are annotated in Mr. Hatcher's personnel file.

***This investigation has been conducted in accordance with the ASSOCIATION OF
INSPECTORS GENERAL Principles & Quality Standards for Investigations.***

REDACTED

Terrance D. Hatcher

September 28, 2009

RECEIVED

OCT 05 2009

Office of
Inspector General

Keith Parks, Chief of Investigations
Office of Inspector General
1317 Winewood Boulevard
Building 5, 2nd Floor
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700

Re: Investigative Case No. 2009-0046

Dear Mr. Parks:

Please find enclosed my written response to the investigative findings in the above referenced case. Please provide me with a copy of the final investigative report once it has been completed.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding my response, please contact me on my cell at: _____ or at my home at: _____

Thank you in advance for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Terrance Hatcher

IN RE:

Investigative Case No.: 2009-0046

**THE INVESTIGATION OF
TERRANCE D. HATCHER**

TERRANCE HATCHER'S RESPONSE TO INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS

Page 5, last paragraph

The OIG's findings state that Mr. Hatcher first agreed and then refused to be interviewed. Mr. Hatcher states that Investigator David Guerden came to his home to interview him on July 21, 2009. Initially, Mr. Hatcher agreed but then informed Investigator Guerden that he did not want to make a statement without having an attorney present. At that time, Investigator Guerden informed Mr. Hatcher that he had until the close of business the following day to get back to him. Shortly after leaving the home, Investigator Guerden called Mr. Hatcher and advised him that even if he did get an attorney, he (Mr. Hatcher) would have to answer the questions, not his attorney and again asked him if he wanted to talk. Mr. Hatcher again declined to talk without counsel, but instead faxed Investigator Guerden a letter and some documents to help in his investigation. (See attached exhibit A.) The documents faxed to Investigator Guerden included a copy of a statement (See attached exhibit B.) and a two page letter that was sent by certified mail to Dawn Schutz and Julian Green attempting to explain his side of the story (See attached exhibit C. While the OIG's findings mention Mr. Hatcher's statement, the findings fail to mention the letter or its contents. Mr. Hatcher requests that the contents of the certified letter be included in the final investigative report.

On the same day that Investigator Guerden came to Mr. Hatcher's home, July 21, 2009, Mr. Hatcher also wrote a letter to [REDACTED], hereinafter referred to as the "grandmother," giving her Investigator Guerden's contact information and asking her to contact him and to tell the truth. Mr. Hatcher was unable to obtain counsel by the close of business on July 22, 2009, Investigator Guerden's deadline. As a result, the following day, on July 23, 2009, Mr. Hatcher faxed Investigator Guerden a letter advising him that he was unable to meet his deadline, but that he had sent a letter to the grandmother asking her to contact him and attached a copy of that letter. (See attached exhibits D and E). The following day, Mr. Hatcher received a call from Investigator Guerden's supervisor advising him not to contact any witnesses and that if he did he could be charged with harassment. Since receiving that call, Mr. Hatcher has had no contact with the OIG or any witnesses regarding this case.

Page 6

Additional Allegation:

Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher attempted to interfere with an official investigation by harassing a witness in order to sway their testimony. If supported, the allegation would be a violation of Section I.C.I. of Department Contract #GJ160, between the

Department and Family Services of Metro Orlando (FSMO); Section 2.1, Article II, of Contract #CM803, between FSMO and Devereux Foundation, Inc.; Section 6 of the Devereux Foundation, Inc. Employee Handbook; and a potential violation of §914.22(3)(a) and (4)(b), F.S.

The OIG's findings state that, "based on witness testimony and records reviewed, the Additional allegation that Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher attempted to interfere with an official investigation by harassing a witness in order to sway their testimony is supported." In response, Mr. Hatcher states the following.

Florida Statute 914.22(3)(a) reads:

§ 914.22 Tampering with or harassing a witness, victim, or informant; penalties.
 (3) Whoever intentionally harasses another person and thereby hinders, delays, prevents, or dissuades any person from:
 (a) Attending or testifying in an official proceeding or cooperating in an official investigation;
 or attempts to do so, commits the crime of harassing a witness, victim, or informant.

The Office of Inspector General's findings state that approximately 1-2 days prior to the validation call (May 6, 2009), Mr. Hatcher telephoned her and asked that she "please" tell his supervisor that he had been conducting home visits and she received a second call from Mr. Hatcher on an unknown date apologizing for his previous call. Mr. Hatcher denies these statements.

Even if the grandmother's statements were true, which they are not, Florida Statute 914.21(3) defines an official investigation as, "any investigation instituted by a law enforcement agency or prosecuting officer of the state or a political subdivision of the state or the Commission of Ethics." According to the grandmother, the conversation allegedly occurred 1-2 days prior to the validation call on May 6, 2009, before an official investigation had begun. Mr. Hatcher was not informed that an official investigation would be conducted until his meeting with Dawn Schutz and Julian Green, which occurred well after the alleged conversation took place. As such, Mr. Hatcher could not have "intentionally" attempted to interfere with an official investigation, when he was not aware that an official investigation would be conducted nor had one begun.

The OIG's findings state that on June 16, 2009, the OIG Investigator received a facsimile from Mr. Hatcher, dated July 23, indicating that he had sent the grandmother a letter, via U.S. Mail, which was dated July 21, 2009. This statement is incorrect. Mr. Hatcher did send a facsimile but it was not on June 16, 2009. (See attached exhibit F.) The first contact that Mr. Hatcher recalls having with the OIG was on July 21, 2009, when Investigator David Guerden came to his home. On that same date, Mr. Hatcher drafted a letter to the grandmother asking her to contact Investigator Guerden and to be truthful. Mr. Hatcher mailed the letter to the grandmother on and faxed a copy to Investigator Guerden on July 23, 2009. On July 24, 2009, Mr. Hatcher received a call from Investigator Guerden's supervisor advising him not to contact any witnesses and that if he did he could be charged with harassment. Mr. Hatcher did not attempt to contact any witnesses after he received the call from Investigator Guerden's supervisor. The letter that OIG has listed in their findings is not a complete and accurate copy of the letter that Mr. Hatcher

mailed to the grandmother. Mr. Hatcher requests that if the letter is to be included in the final report, that it be included in its entirety with no omissions.

While the term harass is not defined in this section, Florida Statute 748.048(1)(a) defines harass as, "to engage in a course of conduct directed at a specific person that causes substantial emotional distress in such person and serves no legitimate purpose." Florida Statute 748.048(1)(b) defines "course of conduct" as, "a pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time, however short, evidencing a continuity of purpose..." Mr. Hatcher denies that he intentionally harassed the grandmother to sway her testimony by mailing her a single letter asking her to contact the OIG's office and tell the truth.

Dated this 28th day of September, 2009.



Terrance D. Hatcher
TERRANCE D. HATCHER

Terrance D. Hatcher

July 21, 2009

Mr. David Guerden
Regional Investigator
Department of Children and Families
Office of Inspector General
400 W. Robinson Street, S1022
Orlando, FL 32801

Re: Investigation of Terrance D. Hatcher

Dear Mr. Guerden:

Today, you came by my apartment to speak to me regarding the allegations made by Devereux. I informed you that I did not wish to speak to you without counsel, to which you replied that was fine, but I had to get back to you by the close of business tomorrow.

In an effort to help your investigation, I have enclosed a copy of the statement that I gave to Devereux along with a copy of a certified letter that I sent to Dawn Schutz, Human Resources Manager, and Julian Green of Devereux. In my letter, I asked that a copy be forwarded to your office or that they provide me with your information so that I could forward it myself. It appears they failed to do either.

As I stated before, I do not wish to speak without counsel. I thought I was innocent until proven guilty, but it seems to be the other way around. Devereux has accused me of something, fired me, and is now prosecuting me and because I have no access to their records, I have no way to prove my innocence. This is why I do not want to speak to you without counsel. I have no interest in helping them to now build a case against me.

I hope the information that I enclosed will be helpful to you. I trust that your investigation will consist of more than the statements of the family.

Sincerely,



Terrance D. Hatcher

Enclosures

Statement of Terrance Devar Hatcher

I, Terrance Devar Hatcher, did not knowingly falsify or alter any official records regarding the minor children. On numerous occasions, in an effort to meet deadlines, I have been asked by my supervisor, Amy Elias, to falsify notes regarding visits with children (for example the children). I have always refused to do so because I take my employment and my reputation very seriously.

Regarding the current allegation, I simply miscoded a visit with the children. At the time that I entered the notes I must have been in a hurry. I say this because in the narrative section of my notes I stated that, "the note will be entered in detail at a later time." Obviously, I forgot to go back and enter detailed notes. I admit that I made a mistake, however, I in no way intentionally or knowingly falsified any records.

TERRANCE D. HATCHER

DATE

Terrance D. Hatcher

June 1, 2009

CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT NO.

Ms. Dawn Schutz
 Human Resources Manager
 5850 T.G. Lee Blvd., Suite 400
 Orlando, FL 32822

Re: Investigation of Terrance D. Hatcher

Dear Ms. Schutz:

During our last meeting you informed me that during your investigation, the _____ Family stated that I had not visited the home for the previous three months (February, March, and April 2009). This is absolutely not true. I have been going through my belongings trying to find old travel reimbursements or any other documents that could be used to refute the family's statements. However, this has been very difficult since I have no access to Devereux's records. As a result, I can only tell you what I remember.

As you are aware the children reside with the father and paternal grandparents. On one evening (after work hours) I scheduled a meeting at the _____ home. _____ contacted me by telephone and informed that the children's paternal Great-Grandmother (_____ mother) would be at the home because she wanted to meet me. _____ made comments regarding her not being "too particular" about me meeting her because she was so close with the children's biological mother. When I arrived, the Great-Grandmother was present and asked me questions. During your investigation, please be sure to contact her so that she can verify that this meeting did occur during the time that the family claimed that I had not visited the home. Also, I entered these notes in the Family Services of Metro Orlando (FSMO) system. I am asking that you please check these notes to further verify that my statements are true.

The next visit that I made to the home was very early in the morning. I went so early because _____ told me that the children left their home at 7:50a.m. to go to their bus stop. When I arrived at the home, I spoke with the children and the Grandfather, _____. _____ told me that he didn't have any answers to my questions about the children and told me that I should really ask _____ if I had any questions about what was going on with the boys because "she knows about stuff like that." _____ was not at home. I also entered these notes into the FSMO system. Please check the FSMO system and my travel reimbursements to verify my statements. Once you find the dates of my visits, please inform me so that I can contact my bank to see if I used my debit card when I stopped at the gas station near the home.

I am not sure why the _____ family is doing this to me, however, if I had to guess I would say it is because I was pushing the issue for the biological mother to see the children. It was very obvious that they did not want the mother to have contact with the children. In fact, they refused to allow the mother to see the children in their home. They also refused to meet the mother so that she could visit the boys outside of the home. Based on _____ comments, it seemed as though they wanted nothing to do with her. If my memory serves me correctly, the last time I picked the boys up for a visit with their mother was in January. I remember because I recall the mother stating that she waited to see the children after she got her taxes so that she could buy them something since she was not able to do so at Christmas. I

also remember because I returned the children to the father, _____, at the BP station on the corner near the home. The children were returned a little later than expected which angered the Grandmother, _____. I sincerely believe that the _____ family intentionally and deliberately lied during your investigation because they did not like the fact that I was pushing for the mother to have contact with the children. I could tell that I was not welcome. In fact, on one occasion, when I reached my hand out to shake the Grandfather, _____ hand, he refused.

During our meeting you informed me that all of my clients, except the _____ family spoke highly of me and that all of my other visits checked out fine. This should be further proof that the _____ family is being untruthful. To me it seems highly illogical that I would visit every other client over those three months except for the _____ family. I feel as though I went above and beyond for my clients. For example, I regularly took time out of my weekends to voluntarily pick the _____ baby up and drive her 21 miles to Longwood to visit with her father who had no car, come back home 21 miles, wait a few hours, then drive back to Longwood to pick the baby up and back home again. That's over 80 miles, not to mention the time that I missed out on with my own wife and children.

I am also concerned because I believe that the investigation may have been conducted while my supervisor, Amy Elias, was out on suspension. It seems to me that at some time during those months, she would have checked to make sure that my visits were being conducted. This would be valuable information for your investigation.

In conclusion, I am asking that you do not simply take the word of the _____ family as your sole source of evidence during your investigation. I am asking that you check all records, including my travel reimbursements, FSMO notes, cell phone records and any other records, including those of my supervisor, _____, to verify my statements as well as the statements of the _____ family and others. If it helps at all, I have reason to believe that one of the visits occurred on February 16, 2009.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to Julian Green of Devereux, who was also present at our meeting. I have also attached a second copy of this letter to be forwarded to the Inspector General's office. If you are unable to forward this letter, please provide me with the Inspector General's information as soon as possible so that I can forward a copy myself. I am also requesting a copy of any public information regarding this investigation. If there is a cost for this service, please inform me as soon as possible so that I can submit payment.

Lastly, I am requesting that the employees of Devereux be instructed not to discuss this matter. I have received several phone calls regarding this matter from people who should have no knowledge regarding this very personal issue.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at:

Sincerely,



Terrance Hatcher

Cc: Julian Green, Devereux, 1010 Executive Center Drive, Suite 200, Orlando, FL 32803

Terrance D. Hatcher

July 23, 2009

Mr. David Guerden
Regional Investigator
Department of Children and Families
Office of Inspector General
400 W. Robinson Street, S1022
Orlando, FL 32801

Re: Investigation of Terrance D. Hatcher

Dear Mr. Guerden:

Due to my current financial situation, I was unable to hire a lawyer by the close of business yesterday. I will continue to try to come up with the money and if I am successful I will have him or her to contact you. I also sent a letter to [redacted] forwarding her your information and asking that she contact you. I have attached a copy of that letter for your records.

Sincerely,



Terrance D. Hatcher

Enclosure

10

Exhibit D Continued

July 21, 2009

Dear]

In May, I had a meeting at Devereux in which I was informed that your family had stated that I had not visited your home in the 3 previous months (February, March, and April 2009). We both know this is not true. I have been going over and over in my brain trying to figure out why your family would have done this and the only thing that I can come up with is that maybe you all did it because you were upset that I was pushing the issue for the children to have contact with their biological mother.

Largely because of your statements, I was terminated. Initially, I thought that maybe my faith was being tested or that God was taking that job away from me in order to give me something better. I don't know. Since my termination, I have not been able to get a job, not been eligible for unemployment and thus I have not been able to provide for my family or pay my child support obligations. In addition, I am facing legal issues for non-payment of child-support and today, I find out that I am facing criminal prosecution because of the allegations. This is becoming too much to bare.

Right now, I am humbly asking you to contact the Office of the Inspector General and tell them the truth so that I can get my life back. You can reach Mr. David Guerden on his cell phone at: [REDACTED] or in his office at: (407) 999-5392. I pray that God puts in your heart to do the right thing. I will continue to pray for you and your family.

Your Former Case Manager,

Terrance Hatcher

Terrance Hatcher

Jul 21 2009 2:24PM

Last 30 Transactions

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Identification</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Pages</u>	<u>Result</u>
Jul 9	9:45AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 9	11:16AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 9	1:53PM	Received		0:44	0	No fax
Jul 9	6:21PM	Received		0:44	0	No fax
Jul 9	8:54PM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 10	9:45AM	Received		0:44	0	No fax
Jul 10	11:45AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 11	8:31AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 11	9:03AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 11	9:44AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 11	2:34PM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 11	2:53PM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 11	5:29PM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 11	7:17PM	Received		0:44	0	No fax
Jul 12	9:30AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 13	9:28AM	Received		0:44	0	No fax
Jul 13	11:05AM	Received		0:44	0	No fax
Jul 13	11:42AM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 13	6:14PM	Received		0:45	0	No fax
Jul 14	8:40AM	Received		0:45	0	Cancel
Jul 14	9:30AM	Received		0:29	0	No answer
Jul 16	9:43AM	Fax Sent	16129775060	0:00	0	No answer
Jul 17	11:15AM	Fax Sent	16129775060	0:00	0	Cancel
Jul 17	11:17AM	Fax Sent	16129775060	0:23	0	OK
Jul 17	11:19AM	Fax Sent	16129775060	1:52	2	OK
Jul 17	11:21AM	Fax Sent	16129775060	0:34	1	OK
Jul 17	11:22AM	Fax Sent	16129775060	2:19	1	Jammed
Jul 21	12:27PM	Fax Sent	4072450631	0:35	2	OK
Jul 21	12:29PM	Fax Sent	4072450631	1:42	5	OK
Jul 21	12:31PM	Fax Sent	4072450631	0:32	1	OK



DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

George H. Sheldon
Secretary



Sheryl G. Steckler
Inspector General

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

MEMORANDUM OF REBUTTAL TO SUBJECT RESPONSE

DATE: November 6, 2009

SUBJECT: Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher (former)

RE: Addendum to Investigative Report #2009-0046

On September 29, 2009, former Devereux Family Case Manager Terrance Hatcher provided a written response to the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) *supported* findings regarding the allegation that Mr. Hatcher attempted to interfere with an official investigation by harassing a witness in order to sway their testimony.

Mr. Hatcher's response to the Investigative Report noted the following concerns:

Additional Allegation:

- Mr. Hatcher indicated that he sent the OIG Investigator a copy of a letter that he (Mr. Hatcher) mailed to the grandmother on July 23, 2009 and not June 16, 2009 as referenced in the Investigative Report.

The Investigative Report has been amended to reflect the correct date of receipt as July 23, 2009.

- Mr. Hatcher contends that he did not attempt to harass the grandmother or attempt to sway her testimony by sending her a letter after the OIG investigation had been initiated.

Through Mr. Hatcher's own admission, he confirmed that he was aware of the ongoing OIG investigation but proceeded to write a letter to the grandmother indicating that because of her statements, he was terminated.

- Mr. Hatcher contends that his letter to the grandmother should have been included, in its entirety, in the Investigative Report.

1317 Winewood Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0700

Mission: Protect the Vulnerable, Promote Strong and Economically Self-Sufficient Families, and Advance Personal and Family Recovery and Resiliency

Although Mr. Hatcher's letter to the grandmother was not included in its entirety in the Investigative Report, the full statement is maintained in the investigative file and can be obtained through a public records request.

- Mr. Hatcher contends that through his readings of Florida Statutes, his single letter to the grandmother should not constitute harassment.

Investigations initiated by the OIG are administrative and do not require the same standards of proof which are necessary for criminal prosecution. The OIG uses the terminology "potential violation" to indicate that the OIG's finding may result in criminal prosecution. Rule 60L-36.005(3)(e), Florida Administrative Code¹ states the following:

Violation of law or agency rules. Employees shall abide by the law and applicable rules and policies and procedures, including those of the employing agency and the rules of the State Personnel System...An agency may determine that an employee has violated the law even if the violation has not resulted in arrest or conviction.

Mr. Hatcher's employment with Devereux was terminated on May 14, 2009 and at that time, he should not have had any further contact with Department clients.

During the OIG investigation, interference with a witness was discovered. The term "harassing" in the Additional Allegation was in reference to that contact. As such, the term was adjusted to "contacting."

Miscellaneous Information:

- Mr. Hatcher contends that his two-page letter sent to the OIG Investigator should have been included in the Investigative Report.

Although Mr. Hatcher's statement was not included in its entirety in the Investigative Report, the full statement is maintained in the investigative file and can be obtained through a public records request.

Only a portion of Mr. Hatcher's written statement was included in the Investigative Report itself as Mr. Hatcher only addressed various meetings with the family in his letter, none of which were directly related to the specific home visits in question.

Because there is no new information that would substantially affect the findings of this investigation, the Additional Allegation that Mr. Hatcher attempted to interfere with an official investigation by contacting a witness in order to sway their testimony remains **supported**.

¹ Through the terms of Contract #GJ160, between the Department and FSMO, and terms of Contract #CM803, between FMSO and Devereux, employees are required to abide by all Federal, State, and Local statutes.

It is noted that the Investigative Report has been amended to reflect the correct date of July 23, 2009 for the letter that Mr. Hatcher mailed to the grandmother.

REDACTED

1317 Winewood Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0700

Mission: Protect the Vulnerable, Promote Strong and Economically Self-Sufficient Families, and Advance Personal and Family Recovery and Resiliency